

Application No. 10/764,745  
Amendment "A" dated October 14, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed July 15, 2005

### REMARKS

#### 1. Claims

The First Office Action of July 15, 2005, considered and rejected claims 1-20, and objected to claim 17. Claim 17 was objected on the basis of an informality in the claim, while claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the inventions, as a result of a minor grammatical informality. The informalities of claims 7 and 17 have been fixed by amendment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to claim 17, and the rejection of claim 7, have been overcome.

Claims 1-17, and 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rappoport et al. (WO 98/36630). Claim 18 was rejected as being unpatentable and obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rappoport in view of Betrisey et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/00448764 A1).<sup>1</sup>

By this paper, claims 1, 19, and 20 have also been amended, and claims 21-24 have been added.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, following this paper, claims 1-24 are pending. Of these claims, claims 1, 19, and 20 are the only independent claims at issue.

As reflected in the claims listing above, claim 1 is generally directed to a method for accessing a scaled font and synthesizing a font variant. As recited, this method includes accessing a font file having a plurality of glyphs, each of the plurality of glyphs storing glyph features, and utilizing the font file in accessing a scaled font that has been scaled for rendering at a target size and target resolution. Further, claim 1 recites accessing the font file and